

SELF-CONSISTENCE OF SEMI-CLASSICAL GRAVITY

Wai-Mo Suen

McDonnell Center for the Space Sciences

Department of Physics, 1105

Washington University, One Brookings Drive

St. Louis, MO 63130-4899

Abstract

Simon argued that the semi-classical theory of gravity, unless with some of its solutions excluded, is unacceptable for reasons of both self-consistency and experiment, and that it has to be replaced by a constrained semi-classical theory. We examined whether the evidence is conclusive.

PACS Number: 04.20-q

Recently Simon¹ suggested that the semi-classical theory of gravity in which the spacetime metric is treated as a classical object coupled to quantum fields,² is self-inconsistent unless some of its solutions are excluded. The point is that the semi-classical Einstein equation admits solutions which are not perturbatively expandable about classical solutions (solutions satisfying the classical Einstein equation). Simon called these nonperturbatively expandable solutions pseudosolutions. He claimed that the semi-classical theory is self-**in**consistent unless the pseudosolutions are excluded by the introduction of perturbative constraints.¹

The reasoning behind the claim is the following: The semi-classical Einstein equation is

$$G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G \langle \hat{T}_{\mu\nu} \rangle^{\text{ren}} \quad , \quad (1)$$

where $G_{\mu\nu}$ is the Einstein tensor and $\langle \hat{T}_{\mu\nu} \rangle^{\text{ren}}$ is the renormalized expectation value of the energy-momentum tensor of the quantum fields. It is noted that¹ the calculation of $\langle \hat{T}_{\mu\nu} \rangle^{\text{ren}}$ involved an expansion in power of $\hbar$

$$\langle \hat{T}_{\mu\nu} \rangle^{\text{ren}} = \langle \hat{T}_{\mu\nu} \rangle_0^{\text{ren}} + \langle \hat{T}_{\mu\nu} \rangle_1^{\text{ren}} \hbar + O(\hbar^2) \quad . \quad (2)$$

The one-loop terms $\langle \hat{T}_{\mu\nu} \rangle_1^{\text{ren}}$, contains higher derivatives, $\square R$, $\nabla_\mu \nabla_\nu R$, etc. They have time derivatives of order higher than those of the $G_{\mu\nu}$ on the left hand side of (1). By a dimensional argument, the $O(\hbar^2)$ term involves even higher derivatives. Now if one insert (2) into (1) with the $O(\hbar^2)$ terms truncated, the higher derivative in the one-loop term will drastically change the character of Eq. (1), independent of the smallness of $\hbar$. The solution space is much larger than that of the classical Einstein equation ($\hbar = 0$), in particular, there are solutions for which the higher derivative

contributions are as large as the classical contributions, and hence not perturbatively expandable about the classical solutions. They are the “pseudosolutions” of Ref. 1. Apparently for these solutions the expansion (2) breaks down and the truncated expression should not be used as the source term in (1) in the first place, as presumably the even higher derivative terms $O(\hbar^2)$ in (2), which has been dropped, have significant contribution. Hence the semi-classical theory in its standard formulation, *i.e.*, a formulation with the “pseudosolutions” included, seems to be self-inconsistent.

Reference 1 further noted that flat space is unstable in the semi-classical theory due to the existence of the higher derivative terms,^{3–6} and argued that this means, independent of the derivation, semi-classical theory in its standard formulation is unacceptable, even if one is to postulate it. It was concluded that:¹ “So, for two reasons, self-consistency and experiment, we should consider perturbative (constrained) semiclassical theory as the “correct” semiclassical gravity, or at least as a potentially correct theory. Semi-classical gravity that does not exclude pseudosolutions cannot be considered even a potentially correct theory.”

In the following we examine whether the evidence is conclusive. We first look at the case of free fields for which the semi-classical theory is very well-studied.² The energy-momentum tensor operator is quadratic in the field operators⁷

$$\hat{T}_{\mu\nu} = \hat{\phi}_{;\nu}\hat{\phi}_{;\nu} + \dots \quad (3)$$

The expectation value $\langle \hat{T}_{\mu\nu} \rangle$ given by (3) with respect to any quantum state is divergent. Nevertheless we can calculate it explicitly, by, say, point-splitting.² Notice that the resulting quantity (i) contains higher derivative terms and (ii) is not an

expansion in $\hbar$.

The next step is to obtain a finite object from this divergent quantity. We have to determine what divergent part to subtract off. It is in figuring out what to subtract that we use an expansion. The counter terms $\langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle^{\text{DS}}$ is taken as the first few terms of this expansion, and the renormalized energy-momentum tensor is given by

$$\langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle^{\text{ren}} = \langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle - \langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle^{\text{DS}} \quad . \quad (4)$$

This is the essence of many renormalization schemes² based on the DeWitt-Schwinger expansion.⁸ In particular, in adiabatic regularization,⁹ $\langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle^{\text{ren}}$ is explicitly represented in this form. For example, in the case of massless, conformally coupled scalar field in Robertson-Walker spacetime studied in Ref. 1, the right hand side of (4) in terms of the adiabatic regularization, is¹⁰

$$\begin{aligned} \langle T_{tt} \rangle = & \frac{1}{2880\pi^2} \left[3H^4 + H\dot{R} - \frac{1}{12}R^2 + H^2R \right] \\ & + \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{k^2 dk}{a^3} \left\{ a|\dot{\psi}_k|^2 + \frac{k^2}{a} |\psi_k|^2 \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$$\langle T_{tt} \rangle^{\text{DS}} = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_0^\infty \frac{k^2 dk}{a^3} \left(\frac{k}{a} \right) \quad . \quad (6)$$

{We display only the tt component for the spatially flat metric; a is the scale factor, $H = \dot{a}/a$ is the Hubble parameter, R is the scalar curvature, an over dot is differentiation with respect to the proper time. $\psi_k(t)$ is the mode function of the scalar field $\hat{\phi} = \int (d^3k/(2\pi)^{3/2}) [\hat{a}_k(e^{ik \cdot x}/a)\psi_k(t) + \hat{a}_a^+(e^{-ik \cdot x}/a)\psi_k^*(t)]$.

Two comments of this procedure of calculating $\langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle^{\text{ren}}$ are in order. Firstly, indeed an expansion is involved in the calculation, but only in the determination of the counter terms $\langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle^{\text{DS}}$. It is **not** that if we want higher accuracy, we have to

include more terms in $\langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle^{\text{DS}}$. So it is **questionable** whether we have to view the resulting $\langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle^{\text{ren}}$ as just the leading terms of an expansion, and that higher and higher derivative terms have been neglected.

What if one choose to include more terms in the counter piece $\langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle^{\text{DS}}$? One is free to include higher and higher order derivative terms as long as they are finite, but there is **no** logical reason why one has to do that. The “traditional” choice of the counter piece can be viewed as the “minimal subtraction”, as called by Parker.¹¹ In this point of view, the renormalized energy-momentum tensor in semi-classical gravity with minimal subtraction is **not** the first few terms in an expansion containing higher and higher derivative terms.

The second comment is more philosophical than logical. Independent of what one choose for the counter piece, whether minimal subtraction or not, the “bare” piece $\langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle$ [first term on right hand side of (4)] by itself contains higher derivative terms, which is not coming from any expansion. Nature could be telling us something by this and we should not easily dismiss this piece of information.

The above discussions are for free fields. For interacting fields, indeed in general we can only calculate the “bare” piece $\langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle$ by expansion, but then we can imagine with the developments of the non-perturbative field theory, we might someday be able to calculate $\langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle$ without resorting to any expansion (in the self-coupling parameter or in $\hbar$). The resulting non-perturbative $\langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle$ must also contain higher derivative terms, as it has to reduce to the free field case in vanishing coupling. In this sense the above discussions might not be crucially relying upon the field being a

free field.

Obviously, without a full quantum theory of gravity, there is no way to tell for sure if the standard semi-classical gravity is a reasonable approximate description of nature in some region of superspace. What we want to argue here is that, within the context of semiclassical gravity (*i.e.*, classical spacetime coupled to quantum fields), it is **not** necessarily logically inconsistent to consider the full effect of the higher derivative terms in the theory. We want to further mention that in many other cases, *e.g.*, in the post-newtonian expansion of the equation of motion for particles in general relativity, higher derivative terms arise as a result of an expansion.¹² In such cases, it is truly logically inconsistent to consider the “pseudosolutions”, and the “constrained treatment” as advocated by Simon¹ should be used. In Ref. 12, such a constrained treatment was carried out for the post-Newtonian expansion. However, in semi-classical gravity, logical consistency does not immediately imply such a treatment. This leads us to study the next question: Is the higher derivative terms with its “pseudosolutions” compatible with experiment?

Reference 1 suggested that the instability of flat space as shown in Refs. 3–6 implied incompatibility. However, for the instability studied in Refs. 3 and 4, the unstable time scale involves an unknown parameter which can be made arbitrarily long and hence the instability may not be practically noticeable, as pointed out in Ref. 3. On the other hand, if the time scale is too short (*e.g.*, of order Planck), we do not expect the semi-classical treatment to be valid in the first place, and hence such an instability becomes irrelevant to the consideration of whether the “pseudosolutions”

are physical.¹³ Further more, the stability study of the Minkowski space in Refs. 3 and 4 are carried out only to the linear order. As also pointed out in Ref. 3, an unstable solution to the linearized equation might not really indicate instability of the full equation. We note that this is particularly the case in the study of instability about the Minkowski space, as the initial constraint equation (the $t - t$ component of the semi-classical Einstein equation) when expanded about the Minkowski solution is second order in the perturbation, and is hence identically zero to the linear order. The existence of an unstable linearized solution may have no physical significance if its second-order extension does not satisfy the initial constraint equation. In Refs. 5 and 6, unstable modes, which are isotropic in space, are found to exist for the full semi-classical Einstein equation independent of the sign and value of the renormalization parameters; and the unstable time scales can be arbitrarily picked. So the Minkowski space is indeed catastrophically unstable for such modes. But as pointed out in Ref. 6, for spatially isotropic perturbation, this instability of the Minkowski space might not be significant until a time in the far future: For isotropic perturbation, the relevant background should be the Friedman universe instead of the Minkowski space. For the particular unstable modes considered, the Hubble parameter of the present universe is still large. It is further shown in Ref. 6 that the Friedmann universe is stable under infinitesimal perturbations in the semi-classical theory. Hence at present we do not have solid physical evidence on experimental/observational ground to rule out the standard semi-classical gravity.

One might argue that the fact that all observed phenomena are describable by

the classical Einstein equation is an evidence against the standard semi-classical theory: With the higher derivative terms in the theory, the solution space is much larger, with a large class of solutions which are not approximately classical solutions (pseudosolutions of Ref. 1). Why do we not see such solutions in the universe? We would like to suggest the possibility that the semi-classical theory, for a range of initial condition, with a set of realistic quantum fields included, may have a set of classical solutions (solutions to the classical Einstein equation) as attractors. A heuristic argument for that is: When the higher derivative terms dominate the semi-classical equation, there are usually rapid changes in the spacetime geometry. Such rapid change would excite the quantum fields and the back-reactions can make the higher derivative terms become subdominant, at least for some regime in the parameter space. An explicit example of this is the reheating of the higher derivative inflationary models (which includes the Starobinsky model¹⁴ criticized in Ref. 1). It is shown¹⁵ that for a wide range of initial parameters the universe ends up in an oscillation phase (a “pseudosolution”), the changing geometry excites the conformally **non-invariant** quantum fields in the universe, and the evolution as determined by the semi-classical equation automatically drives the spacetime into a radiation dominated Friedmann solution¹⁶ (*i.e.*, a “pseudosolution” automatically turns into a classical solution). Such an automatic transition from dominated by the higher derivative terms to dominated by the classical Einstein terms is not possible if only conformally invariant quantum fields are included in the model, as is in the case studied in Ref. 1. Indeed as shown in Ref. 6, both radiation dominated and matter-

dominated Friedmann universes are unstable to infinitesimal perturbation in some measure, if only conformally invariant fields are considered. However, in comparing the semi-classical theory to actual experiment/observation, we should use a realistic set of quantum fields. We believe, whether the standard semi-classical theory, in a certain range of renormalization parameters, with a realistic set of fields, is consistent with experiment/observation or not is still an open question.

There is one related issue that we want to comment on. In the discussion above, we argue that, within the semi-classical theory, which treats spacetime as a classical object coupled to quantum fields, it might not be self-inconsistent to consider the effects of the higher derivative terms in full. One can go further and ask: We know that classical spacetime is most likely the $\hbar \rightarrow 0$ limit of some quantum spacetime description; hence (i) Is it meaningful to retain the $\hbar \neq 0$ effects coming from the matter fields? (ii) If yes, would this restrict the significance of the higher derivative terms?

The first question has been discussed extensively in the literature.² Without a full quantum theory of gravity, there is clearly no way to draw a definite conclusion. What we want to note here is that it is misleading to simply count the power of $\hbar$ in demanding consistency. It could be consistent to study different subsystems to different orders of $\hbar$, even when these subsystems are coupled. An elementary example is the Born-Oppenheimer approximation in molecular physics, where the nuclei are treated to zeroth order in $\hbar$, while electrons are to all orders. In the case of the yet unknown full quantum theory of spacetime and matter fields, the Planck mass could

have the role of nucleus mass, and the semi-classical theory could be meaningful in some region of the superspace.¹⁷ This implies that some of the solutions dominated by the higher-derivative terms in the semi-classical theory (“pseudosolution”) are not physically meaningful in the context of the full theory, namely, those solutions involving Planck energy and time scales. However, not all “pseudosolutions” involve the Planck scale. For example, the unstable modes studied in Refs. 5, 6, as infinitesimal perturbations of the Minkowski space is as far away from the Planck scale as anything can be, at least for a period of time whose length depends on the choices of the initial parameters. In the traditional wisdom that quantum gravity comes in at the Planck scales, such “pseudosolutions” could have significance as approximations in the context of a full quantum theory.

In conclusion, we argued that the semi-classical theory is not necessarily self-inconsistent. Further, some nonperturbatively expandable effects of the higher derivative terms which do not involve the Planck scale could be meaningful even in the context of a full quantum theory. We can even take the attitude that if the (yet unknown) full quantum gravitational sector turns out to have no higher derivative terms, the higher derivative terms generated by the matter field sector could be very significant; whereas if the full quantum sector does have higher derivative terms, our present study of the higher derivative terms in the semi-classical theory can be a useful warmup exercise. It is also argued that at present there is no solid observational/experimental evidence against the inclusion of the “pseudosolutions”. Without excluding such solutions, the semi-classical theory is surely much more falsifiable,

which is not necessary an undesirable feature. It is hope that this paper can draw more attention on this issue of observational/experimental evidence of semiclassical gravity.

I would like to thank Leonid Grishchuk, Leonard Parker, Ian Redmont, and Jonathan Simon for useful discussions. This work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. 91-16682.

References

1. J. Z. Simon, Phys. Rev. D **45**, 1953 (1992). See also J. Z. Simon, Phys. Rev. D **41**, 3720 (1990); **43**, 3308 (1991).
2. See for example, N. D. Birrell and P. C. W. Davies, *Quantum Fields in Curved Space* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982), and references therein.
3. G. T. Horowitz and R. M. Wald, Phys. Rev. D **17**, 414 (1978); G. T. Horowitz, *ibid* **21** 1445 (1980)
4. S. Randjbar-Daemi, J. Phys. **A14**, L229 (1981); R. D. Jordan, Phys. Rev. D **36**, 3593 (1987).
5. W.-M. Suen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 2217 (1989).
6. W.-M. Suen, Phys. Rev. D **40**, 315 (1989).
7. See, for example, Sec. 3.8 of Ref. 2, where the explicit expressions of the energy-momentum tensors of free fields with arbitrary spins are given.
8. J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. **82**, 664 (1951); B. S. DeWitt, Phys. Rep. **19C**, 297 (1975).
9. Adiabatic regularization was first introduced by L. Parker and S. A. Fulling, Phys. Rev D **7**, 2317 (1973). It has been shown to be equivalent to point-splitting by N. D. Birrell, Proc. R. Soc. London **B361**, 513 (1978), and P. R. Anderson and L. Parker, Phys. Rev. **D36**, 2963 (1987) in the cases studied.
10. T. S. Bunch, J. Phys. **A13**, 1297 (1980).
11. L. Parker, private communication.

- 12 L. P. Grishchuk and S. M. Kopejkin, in *Relativity in Celestial Mechanics and Astronomy*, ed. J. Kovalevsky and V. A. Brumberg (IAU. 1986).
- 13 Similar instabilities exist in QED and QCD. For comparisons between instabilities in semi-classical gravity and those in QED and QCD, see R. D. Jordan, Phys. Rev. D **36**, 3593 (1987).
- 14. A. A. Starobinsky, Phys. Lett. **91B**, 99 (1980).
- 15. M. D. Mijic, M. S. Morris, and W.-M. Suen, Phys. Rev. D **34**, 2934 (1986).
- 16. W.-M. Suen and P. R. Anderson, Phys. Rev. D **35**, 2940 (1987).
- 17. J. B. Hartle, in *Gravitation in Astrophysics* ed. B. Carter and J. B. Hartle (Plenum Press, London, 1987).